REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated February 11, 2009 and have made amendments to the claims. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. By virtue of this amendment, claims 21-40 are pending. Claims 7, 14, and 20 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 21-40 have been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 14, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 7, 14, and 20 have been canceled, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Some new claims include similar language, so Applicants offer the following comments. The Examiner stated:

> Claims 7, 14, and 20 all recite "...identity switching is accomplished in only one user step". Upon further consideration of the specification, the metes and bounds of these claims cannot be determined since the specification provides no guidance as to what is meant by "one user step". The closest disclosure the examiner can find is in paragraph 24 of the specification which discusses authorizing access being done in "one step". From the example given in the cited paragraph, it appears that identity switching can be considered to be done in "one step" if the alternate username and/or password is provided as part of the user name string. It is unclear if identity switching can be accomplished in only one user step in other manners or not. Further, note that claims 7, 14, and 20 refers to "providing the first username and alternate class are entered into a single character string so that identity switching is accomplished in one user step". Since from the claim language neither the alternate username nor the password is provided as part of a user name string (as discussed in the specification), what criteria should be used to judge as to whether identity switching is accomplished in only one user step.

New claims contain similar language. For example, new claim 27 recites: "wherein in the receiving step, the first username and alternate class are entered in the single data field entry as a single character string so that identity switching that gives the user access to the computer system

with the set of rights and privileges granted to the alternate class is accomplished in only one user step that comprises the user logging in to the computer system using only the first username, the alternate class, and the password." New claims 34 and 40 contain similar language.

Applicants submit that new claims 27, 34, and 40 clearly show how an identity switching can be performed within a single step. One advantage of the present invention is that the user can enter the first username and an alternate class, which gives the user the identity of an alternate class member. In another embodiment, the user can enter an alternate user name as well. Identity switching does not require an alternate user name per se to be entered but can occur by entering an alternate class as well.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 7 has been canceled, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Some new claims include similar language, so Applicants offer the following comments. New independent claim 21 recites:

> receiving, by a computer system . . . ;
> authenticating, by the computer system . . . ; and
> providing, by the computer system . . . .

Thus, new independent claim 21 clearly recites that each step is being performed by a computer system, which places claim 21 within a statutory class of claims.

Claims 7, 14, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "SSH FAQ - Manpage of ssh" ("sshfaq"). Claims 7, 14, and 20 have been canceled, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

With regard to the new claims and sshfaq, Applicants offer the following comments.

The present invention is directed to an efficient and easy-to-implement method for authenticating one user or class of users and then authorizing access as a different user or class of users. A user can select another user and/or class of users to switch to at login time, such that the identity switching operation can be performed in one step.

One embodiment of the present invention provides a method for switching identity of a user that has a first username associated with a first class of users. In this embodiment, login information is received from the user, with the login information including the first username, an alternate class, and a password. The user is authenticated based on the first username and the password, and access to the computer system is provided as the alternate class, with the alternate class being different than the first class. The login information, in this embodiment, further includes a second username, and access to the computer system is provided with the rights and privileges of the second username.

Another embodiment of the present invention provides a system for switching identity of a user that has a first username associated with a first class of users. The system includes an interface receiving login information from the user, and a processor. The login information includes the first username, an alternate class, and a password. The processor authenticates the user based on the first username and the password, and provides access to the computer system as the alternate class. In this embodiment, the processor provides the user with the experience of a user in the alternate class.

The Examiner states that sshfaq discloses:

> a method for switching identity of a user (p1,"ssh [-I *login_name]* hostname" and DESCRIPTION section, first paragraph) that has a first username associated with a firs class of users (p1, DESCRIPTION section, paragraph 3. *Note that the ssh command allows a user from a local machine to log onto a remote machine and gain access to the remote machine as a user having an account on the remote machine. Further, note that sshfaq recognizes that it is possible for the local and remote machine to have users having the same user name: "...the user names are the same on both seides, the user is immediately permitted to log in". This means that a first username is associated with a first class of users (i.e. the group of users having an account on the local machine) and the first username could also be associated with an alternate class (i.e. the group of users having an account on the local machine). Note that the claim is being read in light of the specification and since paragraph 3 disclose that a class of users refers to a group of users, users having an account on a local machine is considered to be a different class of users than the users having an account on the remote machine.)*, the method comprising the steps of:
> 1. Receiving login information from the user, the login information including the first

username (i.e. "login_name" following ssh —l), an alternate class (i.e. "hostname"), and a password (p1-2. *The password could either be provided via a file or entered by a user on a prompt)*, the first username and the alternate class being received as part of the user identification input of the login information entered by the user (p1, SYNOPSIS section).

2. Authenticating the user based on the first username and the password (p1, DESCRIPTION SECTION, paragraph 2 and p2, last three paragraphs).

3. Providing access to the computer system as the alternate class (p2, next to last paragraph)

4. Wherein the alternate class is different than the first class (p1-2). *The group/class of users having an account on the local machine is inherently different from the group/class of users having an account on the local machine.*

5. In the receiving step, the first username and the alternate class are entered into a single data field as a single character string so that identity switching is accomplished in only one user step (p1, "ssh [-l *login_name]* hostname" and DESCRIPTION section, first paragraph). *Note that the ssh command, the login_name, and the hostname are all entered into a single character string into the local terminal.*

New independent claims 21 recites:

receiving, by a computer system, login information from the user, the login information including the first username, an alternate class, and a password associated with the first username, the first username and the alternate class being received as part of a user identification input of the login information entered by the user, the first username and alternate class being entered by the user as a single data field entry, the first user name being associated with a class of users granted a first set of rights and privileges associated with the computer system, and the alternate class being granted a second set of rights and privileges associated with the computer system;

authenticating, by the computer system, the user based on the first username and the password; and

providing, by the computer system, access to the computer system as the alternate class,

wherein the alternate class is different than the first class.

New independent claims 29 and 35 contain similar recitations.

Thus, the independent claims now recite that the first user name is associated with a class of users granted a first set of rights and privileges associated with the computer system, and the alternate class is granted a second set of rights and privileges associated with the computer system. This is different than a user from a local machine logging into a remote machine and gaining access to the remote machine as a user having an account on the remote machine. In the present invention, the user has an account on the computer system that is granted with a first set of rights and privileges while the members of the alternate class are granted a second set of rights and privileges on the computer system. As pointed out by the Examiner, sshfaq merely teaches a group of users associated with a first machine (local machine) and a group of users associated with the second (remote machine). This is completely differently than the present invention. The remaining arguments presented by the Examiner are also overcome by the above remarks.

Applicants believe that the differences between sshfaq and the present invention are clear in new claims 21, 29, and 35, which set forth various embodiments of the present invention. Therefore, claims 21, 29, and 35 distinguish over the sshfaq reference. Further, claims 22-28, 30-34, and 36-40 depend from claims 21, 29, and 35. Thus, claims 22-28, 30-34, and 36-40 also distinguish over the sshfaq reference.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application and the claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

–12–

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (561) 989-9811 should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 9, 2009

By: /Stephen Bongini/
　　　　Stephen Bongini
　　　　Reg. No. 40,917

FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN
BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.
One Boca Commerce Center
551 N.W. 77th Street, Suite 111
Boca Raton, Florida 33487
Telephone: (561) 989-9811
Facsimile: (561) 989-9812